

To: Enos, Cassandra@DWR[Cassandra.Enos@water.ca.gov]
Cc: Foresman, Erin[Foresman.Erin@epa.gov]
From: Skophammer, Stephanie
Sent: Wed 10/29/2014 4:47:24 PM
Subject: RE: EPA comment meetings

Hi Cassandra,

Thanks for your message. Erin and Tim are both at the science conference, so when they are back in the office on Friday we'll all check our schedules together and get back to you. Sorry for the delay- I agree we should get the last meetings on the calendar soon since the holidays are approaching.

Thanks-

Stephanie

From: Enos, Cassandra@DWR [mailto:Cassandra.Enos@water.ca.gov]
Sent: Tuesday, October 28, 2014 10:34 AM
To: Foresman, Erin L SPK; Skophammer, Stephanie
Subject: EPA comment meetings

Erin and Stephanie – Thanks for providing the dates for the water quality and habitat meetings. As you know, they are scheduled for November 10th and 13th. Please feel free to forward the meeting notice to anyone from EPA that needs to attend. I just wanted to see if you had some proposed dates for the meetings below. We might as well get them on the calendar too since we're getting close to the holiday season.

Thanks much, Cassandra

Technical Meeting #2 – Mercury and Selenium

Attendees:

- DWR – Cassandra Enos

- [redacted] EPA –Stephanie Skophammer, Tim Vendlinski, Janet Hashimoto
- [redacted] ICF – Adam Smith, Jennifer Pierre, Ben Giudice, Erin Healey
- [redacted] DFW – Carl Wilcox
- [redacted] USFWS – Leanna Zweig, Larry Rabin
- [redacted] NMFS – Cathy Marcinkevage
- [redacted] USBR – Michelle Banonis

Goal for the meeting: *need to be defined*

Topics for Discussion:

- [redacted] EPA concerned that DEIS underestimates the potential impacts of methylmercury and selenium contributions from restoration and operations.
- [redacted] How will programmatic benefits to resident and migratory fishes from CM2 and CM4 be estimated and compared to estimated negative effects of CM1, CM2, and CM4?

Technical Meeting #4 – Detailed Analyses/Adequacy of the Document Issues

Attendees:

- [redacted] DWR – Cassandra Enos, Bill Harrell, Mike Bradbury
- [redacted] EPA – Erin Foresman, Stephanie Skophammer
- [redacted] ICF – Jennifer Pierre, Adam Smith, Rebecca Sloan, Chandra Chilmakuri
- [redacted] DFW – Carl Wilcox
- [redacted] USFWS – Matt Nobriga, Larry Rabin, Steve Culberson, Lori Rinek
- [redacted] NMFS – Cathy Marcinkevage
- [redacted] USBR – Michelle Banonis
- [redacted] Corps- Sue Clark

Goal for the meeting: Discuss changes that are being made to the document to address some of these concerns that are Adequacy of the Document issues.

Topics for Discussion:

- EPA concerned that the DEIR/EIS does not provide enough detail regarding the potential outcomes of the system impact studies and how that may affect procurement and placement of transmission and associated infrastructure, and associated terrestrial effects. .
- EPA concerned that BDCP and DEIR/EIS do not include adequate detail regarding export operations. In the south Delta, more detail is sought in regards to the Corps permit for SWP Banks operations and how BDCP use of that facility would meet Corps' goal of minimizing erosion. Additionally a description of CVP/SWP operations with and without each alternative should be included in Chapter 3 and add more detail to the north Delta bypass rules description. EPA also seeks clarification regarding E/I ratio used for BDCP.
- EPA is concerned that the relationship between the CM2 analysis and the current Reclamation planning efforts in Yolo Bypass are not clearly enough defined, including additional project-level analysis, relationship to BiOp, and if additional water would be needed to flood the bypass.
- EPA is concerned that the extent of wetlands, vernal pools, and waters have been underestimated. The extent of wetlands in the study area were determined based primarily on aerial mapping and the DEIR/EIS does not provide an estimate of the GIS-based mapping accuracy.
- EPA concerned that the DEIS air quality analysis did not adequately evaluate all conservation measures for general conformity.
- EPA concerned that the DEIR/EIS does not discuss effects on downstream resources or how Delta operations could require changes in upstream operations.
- Discuss how the decision rules will be described to determine impact determinations.
- EPA concerned that, in some cases, different NEPA effects determinations are provided for similar analyses and some NEPA conclusions were not provided.EPA is concerned that in-water construction BMPs are not clearly enough defined or may not be feasible or applicable on the scale required for BDCP.
- What is planned for dredged material and reuseable tunnel material?
- Discuss whether any additional information will be provided on energy usage for the BDCP and CVP/SWP system.

- EPA is concerned that the DEIS discussion of groundwater use changes as a result of surface water deliveries is not adequate. BDCP should consider including a mitigation measure for groundwater management in southern San Joaquin Valley.

Cassandra Enos-Nobriga

Environmental Management

Bay-Delta Conservation Plan

Department of Water Resources

901 P Street, Sacramento, CA 95814

Office: (916) 651-0178

Mobile: (916) 835-6981